

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22-24 and 29-35 are pending in this application.

Claims 22-24, and 31 are amended.

Claim 36 is newly added.

1. Claims 22-24 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hakim, in view of Gossett et al. The Office Action cites new art Hakim, in combination with Gossett. Hakim discloses a PSTN phone terminal operated in conjunction with an Internet gateway. The PSTN phone terminal has a particular telephone number that is connected by the PSTN. A caller makes a PSTN call to the particular telephone number of the PSTN terminal, and a determination is there made whether or not to allow the call to be made over the Internet via an Internet gateway associated with the PSTN terminal. If the call is authorized for the Internet, then the call is communicated by the particular Internet gateway to a destination address over the Internet. The PSTN caller continues the call through the PSTN terminal (or at least to the PSTN telephone number initially called). The authorization for the call is associated with both the particular PSTN terminal and the corresponding Internet gateway at that PSTN terminal. The call does not occur over the Internet unless and until authorized at the PSTN terminal in the PSTN call to the particular number. If authorized, the caller continues in connection to the PSTN number over the PSTN, and connection of the call is made to the Internet through the particular gateway for the PSTN number.

Gossett discloses a “routing engine” that controls routes by which VoIP calls are connected in the packet-switched network between call maker and call recipient. The Gossett routing engine selects one destination gateway from among a plurality of destination gateways

eligible to receive/terminate a call (e.g., Gosset, col. 5, lines 14-19). A call directed over the packet switched network is controlled by the Gossett routing engine to particular destination path. In other words, Gossett directs the Internet destination of a call that is already being handled over the Internet, whereas Hakim dictates whether or not a call can ever make it onto the Internet.

Applicant's amended claims point out that a call on the packet-switched network is initially destined to a central platform. At the central platform, an authentication determination is made. If the authentication passes, then the central platform hands-off the call for the packet-switched network to route to destination. Hakim is at an "edge" of the packet network, and PSTN calls are authenticated through Hakim to get onto the packet network. Gossett directs packet network calls in route over the packet network, but only as to available destination from among several possibilities. Neither Hakim nor Gossett teach or suggest any centralized authentication platform within/of the packet-switch network or any hand-off from such platform upon authentication with control of routing by the packet-switched network to destination.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 22-24 and 29-36, and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance in this case.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the undersigned attorney for Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any issues. The Office is authorized to charge any excess fees or to credit any overage to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 31, 2008

By /H. Dale Langley, Jr. /
H. Dale Langley, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,927

The Law Firm of H. Dale Langley, Jr., PC
610 West Lynn
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: (512) 477-3830
Facsimile: (512) 480-0858
E-Mail: dlangley@iptechlaw.com